



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/909,198

07/19/2001

Louis Stoll

10378/4

9731

7590

01/12/2006

KENYON & KENYON
One Broadway
New York, NY 10004

EXAMINER

ABRISHAMKAR, KAVEH

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2131

DATE MAILED: 01/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/909,198

Applicant(s)

STOLL, LOUIS

Examiner

Kaveh Abrishamkar

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 December 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 12-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 12-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on December 8, 2005 has been entered.

2. Claims 12-19 are currently being considered.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed December 8, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive because:

Regarding claim 12, the Applicant argues that the CPA, Wood et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,668,322), does not teach "periodically validating access privileges based on contractual relationship information." This argument is not found persuasive. Wood discloses an architecture wherein trust levels are established commensurate with certain resources. Based on what trust level requirement an application has, an existing login credential can be used, or a new login credential must be created which meets the trust level requirement (column 5 lines 46-57). This trust level to user mapping is

viewed as a “contractual relationship” as the trust level establishes rules of which applications the user can access with the credentials that were generated at that trust level. Therefore, it is respectfully asserted that Wood does teach a “periodically validating access privileges based on contractual relationship information” wherein trust levels are analogous to “contractual relationship” given the broadest reasonable interpretation. Furthermore, the Applicant argues that the CPA does not explicitly teach “deleting login data or creating login data according to said validating.” This argument is not found persuasive. Wood teaches that session credentials and the underlying login credentials are periodically validated for reasons such as the temporal validity of the session credential (column 8 lines 44-67). If the login credential remains valid, a replacement session credential is issued, and if not, the login credential and session credential are deleted (column 8 lines 57-67). The login credentials may be subject to being reauthenticated if the trust level mappings have changed (column 8 line 57 – column 9 line 6). Therefore, it is asserted that the CPA does teach “deleting login data or creating login data according to said validating.”

Therefore, the rejections for claims 12-18 are maintained, and the CPA is applied to reject newly added claim 19 as described below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 2131

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 12-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wood et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,668,322).

Regarding claim 12, Wood discloses:

A method for updating privileges for access to an information system,
comprising:

periodically validating access privileges based on contractual relationship
information (column 5 lines 46-57); and

deleting login data or creating login data according to said validating (column 6
lines 57-67, column 8 line 44 – column 9 line 6).

Claim 13 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 12. Furthermore, Wood discloses:

The method of claim 12, wherein said validating includes matching a login data item to the contractual relationship information (column 6 lines 44-56).

Claim 14 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 12. Furthermore, Wood discloses:

The method of claim 12, wherein the contractual relationship information is included within an eligibility database (column 6 lines 23-33).

Claim 15 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 12. Furthermore, Wood discloses:

The method of claim 12, wherein said validating access privileges includes updating a datapage (column 6 lines 23-33).

Claim 16 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 12. Furthermore, Wood discloses:

The method of claim 12, wherein said validating includes cross-referencing eligibility information with security information (column 6 lines 23-33).

Claim 17 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 12. Furthermore, Wood discloses:

The method of claim 12, wherein said validating includes matching business rules to user login information (column 6 lines 1-9).

Claim 18 is rejected as applied above in rejecting claim 12. Furthermore, Wood discloses:

The method of claim 12, wherein said validating includes periodically validating access privileges based on contractual relationship information wherein said access

Art Unit: 2131

privileges define at least one or a program type, data item type, feature type, and menu option type (column 5 lines 46-57, column 6 lines 57-67).

Regarding claim 19, Wood discloses:

A method for updating privileges for access to an information system, comprising:

periodically validating access privileges based on contractual relationship information (column 5 lines 46-57);

creating login data independent of an attempt to access information in the system (column 6 lines 57-67, column 8 line 44 – column 9 line 6).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kaveh Abrishamkar whose telephone number is 571-272-3786. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2131

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KA
01/06/2006


AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100